UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,713	06/30/2000	Hideo Ago	SHIM-007	2056

24353 7590 07/22/2003

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
200 MIDDLEFIELD RD
SUITE 200
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
LY, CHEYNE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1631	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/608,713	AGO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheyne D Ly	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *May 23, 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *19-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *19-29,32 and 34-36* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *30,31,33 and 37-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *19-39* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *21* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' arguments in Paper No. 20, filed December May 23, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

2. The addition of new claims 37-39 has been acknowledged.

3. Claims 30, 31, 33, and 37-39 are examined on the merits.

SEQUENCE COMPLIANCE

4. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR § 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). See, for example, pages 9-10b, and 20. However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.821 through 1.825 because pages 9-10b, and 20, contain amino acid sequences with sequence lengths that are equal to or greater than 4 amino acid molecules and these sequences do not have SEQ ID Nos cited along with each sequence in the specification. Applicants are reminded that a CD-ROM sequence listing submission may replace the paper and computer readable form sequence listing copies. Applicant(s) are required to submit a new computer readable form sequence listing, a paper copy for the specification, statements under 37 CFR § 1.821(f) and (g), if there is a need to list additional sequences in the listing. Applicant(s) are given the same response time regarding this failure to comply as that set forth to respond to this office action. Failure to respond to this

requirement may result in abandonment of the instant application or a notice of a failure to fully respond to this Office action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 30, 31, 33, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a crystal structure of HCV polymerase using $NS5B_{570, 544, 536 \text{ and } 531}$, does not reasonably provide enablement for all HCV polymerase. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

7. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 30, 31, and 33 as recited in the previous office action Paper No. 19, mailed February 26, 2003. This rejection is hereby extended to new claims 37-39.

8. It is acknowledged that applicants have disclosed information to enable one skilled in the art to make a crystal of the HCV polymerase using $NS5B_{570, 544, 536 \text{ and } 531}$ (Examples 1-3, Pages 20-27). However, the breadth of claims 30, 31, 33, and 37-39 includes HCV polymerase $NS5B_{570, 544, 536 \text{ and } 531}$ crystals and modified versions of HCV polymerase crystals, which go beyond the crystals cited in Examples 1-3 ($NS5B_{570, 544, 536 \text{ and } 531}$).

9. Applicants provide a publication by Adachi et al. to support the predictability of the art of crystallizing HCV polymerase. Applicants argue that the disclosure and cited support enable

the full scope of the claims 30, 31 and 33 regard to the limitations of the method for identifying a HCV polymerase inhibitor. Applicants' arguments, pointed to enablement support for $NS5B_{570, 544, 536 \text{ and } 531}$, and cited publications have been fully considered and they have been found to be unpersuasive.

10. It is noted that Applicants' pointed to support in Adachi et al. further document the unpredictability of the art of crystallization. Adachi et al. discloses the proteins were produced in similar conditions and the qualities of the crystals were different (page 44, column 2, § 3.4, lines 4-7).

11. As cited in Paper No. 14, mailed September 26, 2002, it is well documented that protein crystallization is in essence a trial-and-error method, and the results are usually unpredictable (Drenth, J.). Further, as recently as November 1, 2002, Science published a *New Focus* article depicting the current state of the art for protein crystallization that supports the unpredictability of the art. In essence, protein crystallization is still a trial and error process because the current technology for producing protein for the crystallization process is unpredictable, which results in high failure rate for proteins that are being crystallized. Therefore, researchers continue to have trouble generating sufficient protein required for the crystallization process (Science, 2002). The citation of a few successful but isolated crystal structures of HCV polymerase does not help the instant applicant to overcome the overwhelming evidence provided by *New Focus* stating the unpredictability of the art of protein crystallization. For example, "[s]o far, these projects have targeted more than 18,000 proteins but solved the structures of only about 200" (Page 948, Column 3, lines 4-6).

12. Therefore, it is further re-iterated that it is unreasonable to expect one skilled in the art to use the information disclosed for one specific crystal to make other of predictable quality that are different from the crystal disclosed in the specification without undue experimentation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 30, 31, 33, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US006183121B1 in view of In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) taken with Bressanelli et al. (1999).

4. This rejection is maintained with respect to claims 30, 31, and 33 as recited in the previous office action Paper No. 19, mailed February 26, 2003. This rejection is hereby extended to new claims 37-39.

5. Applicants argue that the Bressanelli et al. (November 09, 1999) prior art document is published after the claimed priority date of the instant application (Japan 11-188630, July 02, 1999 and Japan 11-192488, July 07, 1999). Applicants' arguments have been fully considered and found to be unpersuasive. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on applications filed in Japan. It is noted that the certified foreign priority documents are in the instant application. However, priority benefit cannot be granted without certified translations of the documents that are in a foreign language.

6. It is re-iterated that Kim et al. discloses a method that uses "atomic coordinates of all the amino acids of NS3 helicase according to FIG. 1 .+-. a root mean square deviation from the backbone atoms of said amino acids of not more than 1.5 .ANG., to generate a three-dimensional structure of molecule comprising a NS3 helicase-like binding pocket, as in instant claim 30. For the first time, the present invention permits the use of molecular design techniques to identify, select and design chemical entities, including inhibitory compounds, capable of binding to NS3 helicase-like binding pockets—in particular, the oligonucleotide binding pocket of NS3 helicase" (Column 14, lines 27-38), as instant claims 31 and 33. "Thus, any compound which fits into a pocket comprising the structural coordinates .+-. a root mean square of 1.5 .ANG. or less from the backbone atoms of these amino acids is a potential inhibitor of the NS3 helicase" and data disclosed

in Table 1 suggest the inhibitory nature of potential inhibitors (Column 31, 36-45 and Table 1), as in claims 37-39.

7. Even though the method disclosed by Kim et al. does not specify that the three-dimensional structural coordinate is derived from a HCV polymerase, the specific limitations of three-dimensional structural coordinate is derived from a HCV polymerase in this instant case do not distinguish the invention from the prior art in term of patentability because they are descriptive nonfunctional subject matter.

8. In re Gulack defines nonfunctional descriptive material, as when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in term of patentability. Also, the MPEP indicates that descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition (MPEP § 2106 (IV)(B)(b)). Specific to the instant case, the three-dimensional structural coordinates derived from a HCV polymerase of a method for identifying a HCV polymerase inhibitor are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the active steps of the method for identifying a HCV polymerase inhibitor, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer.

9. Bressanelli et al. discloses a crystal structure of the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase of hepatitis C virus where the catalytic domain of the HCV RdRp consists of the 531 amino-

terminal residues of NS5B. As a key step to developing specific anti-HCV drugs that interfere with viral replication (Page 13034, lines 23-26).

10. Clearly, an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to partake the concept emphasized by Kim et al. for a method that uses of molecular design techniques to identify, select and design chemical entities, including inhibitory compounds based on the 3-dimensional structure of a polymerase and apply such method to the crystal structure for RNA-dependent RNA polymerase of hepatitis C virus as disclosed by Bressanelli et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the method taught by Kim et al. with the crystal structure coordinates of the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase of hepatitis C virus disclosed by Bressanelli et al. for identifying a HCV polymerase inhibitor.

CONCLUSION

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

12. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 193), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (703) 308-3880. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

16. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

C. Dune Ly
7/21/03

Arthur D. Marshall